

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  
020431.0841

12102104

APPLICATION NO.  
USSN 09/895,654

2165  
41

1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Manoel Tenorio

Serial No.: 09/895,654

**RECEIVED**

Filing Date: June 28, 2001

**DEC 07 2004**

Confirmation No.: 6772

**Technology Center 2100**

Group Art Unit: 2165

Examiner: Samuel G. Rimell

Title: Translation Between Product Classification Schemas

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**“EXPRESS MAIL”**

Express Mailing Label Number:  
EV 323310882 US

Date of Deposit: November 30, 2004.

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service “Express Mail Post Office to Addressee” service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

*Willie Jiles*

Willie Jiles

Dear Sir:

**Statement of Substance of Interview**

In an Interview Summary mailed November 1, 2004, Applicant was instructed as follows:

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office Action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

At the time Applicant received the Interview Summary, no Office Action had been issued. Rather, Examiner Rosen telephoned Applicant's attorney with a proposed Restriction Requirement. Applicant provides this Statement of Substance of Interview for completeness of the record.

Applicant accepts the Examiner's statement of the substance of the interview except as modified by the following comments. In particular, Applicant agrees that a provisional election of Claims 1-25 was made by Applicant during the telephone interview. However, Applicant did not and does not necessarily agree with or acquiesce to the Examiner's conclusion that Claims 1-25 and Claims 26-28 should be grouped separately or that Claims 26-28 should be classified as business methods.

Applicant notes that since receiving the Examiner's Interview Summary, Applicant has received an Office Action from a different Examiner, Examiner Samuel Rimell, in which the restriction requirement was vacated and all original Claims 1-28 were examined on the merits.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Christopher W. Kennerly, Attorney for Applicant, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6812.

Although Applicant believes no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTs L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant

  
Christopher W. Kennerly  
Reg. No. 40,675

Date: November 30, 2004

Correspondence Address:

Customer ID No. **05073**